DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 149 SP 002 460

National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. Second Annual Report.
National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Jan 69
Note-76p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.90
Descriptors-Administrative Organization, Disadvantaged Youth, Educational Finance, *Educational Needs, Federal Legislation, *Federal Programs, Program Effectiveness, *Teacher Education
Identifiers-Education Professions Development Act, EPDA, USOE, U.S. Office of Education (U.S.O.E.)

The second annual report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, addressed to the President and to Congress, presents recommendations in the use and training of educational personnel for educational improvement. The report is divided into sections which include recommendations concerning legislation and appropriations for improving educational programs; an argument for decentralization of administrative organization (such as the establishment of a Department of Education with cabinet rank); approaches to the problem of increasing the number and effectiveness of educational personnel who serve students from low income families (such as the use of differentiated roles and career development programs for educational personnel); recommendations for meeting quality and quantity demands in teaching manpower through increasing the impact and relevance of federal programs; a presentation of the need for support of research and evaluation related to education personnel development (including evaluations of educational personnel programs); and the importance of early effective planning for the future development of educational personnel. Also included are recommendations addressed to the Commissioner of Education on policies of direct concern to the Office of Education. (For First Annual Report see SP 002 381.) (SM)

ED028149

SP002460

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Second Annual Report

National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development

National Advisory Council on
Education Professions Development

January 31, 1969

Sirs:

We are pleased to present to you herewith the 1968-69 Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, submitted in accordance with Section 502 of Public Law 90-35.

In succinct form, this Report attempts to bring to attention findings and recommendations bearing unusual significance at this precise time.

We invite your expressions with regard to the contents of this Report and also with respect to ways in which this Council may perform the responsibilities assigned to it.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurence D. Haskew

Laurence D. Haskew
Chairman

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Spiro T. Agnew
President of the Senate
Washington, D. C.

Honorable John McCormack
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

308 Vanguard Building / 1111 - 20th Street, N.W. / Washington, D.C. 20036 / (202) 382-8712

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
	Letter of Transmittal	
Recommendations Addressed to the President and the Congress		
I	Introduction	1
II	Legislation and Appropriations	4
III	Organization of the Federal Effort	16
IV	Education Personnel for Students from Low-Income Families	24
V	Manpower: Quality and Quantity	32
VI	Research and Evaluation	42
VII	The Future	49
Recommendations Addressed to the Commissioner of Education		55
	List of Members of the Council	72

I. INTRODUCTION

The Federal government is playing an increasing role as a partner with the other levels of government in the improvement and reform of American education. Nowhere is this more evident than in its involvement with the training and development of educational personnel.

This involvement is extensive. Multiple programs have been authorized. These programs are administered through a score of Executive Branch agencies. Their results are felt in almost every category of personnel serving the educational enterprise. It is estimated that in Fiscal Year 1969 the investment in this kind of endeavor is in excess of $375 million.

To review and evaluate this effort, the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development was established by Public Law 90-35. Since it was organized in October 1967, the Council has examined the relevant legislative enactments; reviewed programs with agency heads; studied administrative policies, guidelines and operational decisions;

held hearings in the field; and conducted investigations of some major issues.

Our findings and recommendations in this Second Annual Report fall under two headings.

First, existing efforts in education personnel development are extensive and significant. However, their full potential has not yet been realized. We have outlined in Sections II to VI of this Report some ways by which these efforts may be made more effective. In this connection, we have included, in a special section of this Report, some recommendations addressed to the Commissioner of Education concerning matters which fall under his purview.

Second, there are problems in this field of educational endeavor which have not yet received attention and on which urgent action is required. In Section VII we have cited examples of these problems and have suggested reasons for the need for urgent action.

It is clear that the United States must improve its education dramatically. It is equally clear that one of the keys to this improvement lies in the training and development

of educational personnel. This Report is concerned with the contribution of the Federal effort to this improvement - to date and for the future.

II. LEGISLATION AND APPROPRIATIONS

The Federal government is quite properly making substantial investments in education. Among these investments, the returns per dollar vary sharply. In its examination of expenditures directed at securing and training people for the educational enterprise, this Council finds that returns from the investment in this strategic service are impressive.

A Policy for the Next Biennium

The next two years will be critical in meeting the needs of education personnel development in this country. There must be no pause in the efforts already begun. This Council recommends a policy for the next biennium which calls for action on two fronts.

First, we must meet head-on the problems which have not received attention to date. These are of such magnitude that nothing less than massive attacks will be adequate. Many of these attacks will require Federal government initiation and leadership. They must be designed and gotten underway without

delay. We outline our concerns in this regard in Section VII of this Report.

Second, we must make our present programs work to something approaching their potential. Over the past few years the Congress has passed a number of important pieces of legislation aimed at improving the training and development of educational personnel. But legislation, of itself, cannot assure results. The intent of such statutes can be realized only by adequate funding, effective administration by the Federal agencies, and imagination and hard work on the part of those concerned in the schools, colleges, and other educational settings.

In this and succeeding sections of this Report we have attempted to identify some of the factors that are crucial in making currently authorized programs work more effectively.

Funding for Existing Programs

Improving the qualifications of educational personnel is a key strategy in the national effort to improve education. The underfinancing of education personnel development programs

in Fiscal Year 1969 is, therefore, hard to understand.

Almost every categorical educational support program of the Federal government involves personnel development. The success of such programs as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for example, depends on the effective performance of tens of thousands of people. Funds available for training in these programs made possible only a token effort in this important function.

Other programs whose explicit concern is education personnel development were confronted with an even more serious situation. The Education Professions Development Act, for example, is designed to provide for scores of categories of educational personnel. However, current appropriations for this Act permitted the funding of so few proposals in any one of these categories that the impact intended by the legislation has been severely limited.

In view of these findings, we urge that the Executive Branch as it prepares requests for Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971, and the Congress as it makes appropriations, give education personnel development the support required to exploit

its strategic role. We estimate that the needs for the coming year will be $200 million over the amounts appropriated in Fiscal Year 1969.

Appropriate Legislative and Executive Policies

Greater effectiveness from present Federal government involvements in education personnel development is possible through changes in existing legislative and executive policies. In the following recommendations we single out a few highly strategic, and accomplishable, advances:

1. Forward funding, by at least one full fiscal year, should be provided to assure minimal levels on which program planning can proceed. Forward funding assuring at least the level provided for a given program in the preceding year is essential. All segments of education personnel development should receive this treatment, but if that is impossible, we urge strongly Fiscal 1970 and 1971 action to encompass the Education Professions Development Act, the training programs of the National Science Foundation, and Titles I and III

of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

2. The Council has taken special note of two practices that the Office of Education has adopted to make more effective use of program funds. One of these involves giving priority to certain critical fields or problem areas in the funding of proposals. The other (sometimes called "packaging") involves bringing to bear several Federal programs on a plan developed by one of the States to accomplish specific objectives. We urge the Congress and its committees to encourage the Office of Education in the employment of these practices, particularly in the administration of the Education Professions Development Act. The nature of this Act lends itself ideally to securing the comprehensive attacks necessary to produce a critical mass of improvement efforts. These practices offer constructive opportunities for state collaboration with the Federal government and for producing enough impact to make a difference.

3. The Office of Education should be provided

with staff adequate to enable it to discharge its grave responsibilities. Tragic understaffing was continued into Fiscal 1969, although the false economy of such action was already convincingly evident. This condition should be overcome forthwith and decisively.

We also urge that specific amounts for staffing and other expenses be calculated for each of the major units of the Office of Education, rather than by estimating and allocating a blanket amount for all Office activities. The latter policy almost inevitably results in inadequate support for the effective implementation of the statutes.

4. The Teacher Corps program should be financed at a minimum level of $40,000,000 for Fiscal Year 1970. To continue the present token levels of support is to condemn a challenging idea to slow death. The Teacher Corps rests essentially upon the commitment of service-motivated persons to a patriotic endeavor on behalf of their nation; if the nation is half-hearted, the essential ingredient is absent.

5. When the Education Professions Development Act was passed in 1967, institute programs previously authorized under other legislation were incorporated into Part D of the new Act. The Office of Education gave assurances to the Congress that these institutes would be supported at the same level as in previous years. However, limited appropriations and mandated expenditure cuts have resulted in a situation where maintaining institute programs at those levels makes it difficult to give needed support to other categories of activity under Part D. <u>This agreement ought to be modified so that, in the face of contingencies such as limited funding, balanced attention to the full range of programs under Part D may be possible.</u>

Staffing for Higher Education

The task of staffing America's institutions of higher education remains a prodigious one. The Federal government's concern with and assistance toward accomplishing this task is wise and sound. The Title IV NDEA Graduate Fellowship

Program is commended. The drastic cutback in new fellowship awards under this Title for Fiscal Year 1969 is regrettable. Continued for another year, such reduction will have serious effects. The appropriations for new fellowships for Fiscal Year 1970 should, at the very least, represent a return to fiscal 1968 levels.

Doubly pressing is the necessity for assuring adequately prepared staff for instruction and administration in the years immediately following secondary school - in junior colleges, technical institutes and the lower division of four-year colleges. At the very least, the number of new entrants for the next five years must be double that for the preceding five years. The Federal government simply must help on a level which it has not provided up to now. Part E of the Education Professions Development Act is readily adaptable to this purpose. Appropriations for Part E of the Education Professions Development Act should be increased markedly for Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971. The applications for assistance under this Part in Fiscal Year 1969 testify to this necessity. Their caliber likewise testifies to a

reservoir of quality potential ready to be tapped. Office of Education awards show special attention has been given to developing programs in new settings equipped to provide graduate training for post-secondary school staff members not now eligible for support under Title IV of the National Defense Education Act. Increased appropriations apparently can be extremely well invested.

Improving the Quality of Proposals

A great slippage occurs between the intent of legislation and the nature of the programs funded by Federal agencies. One major cause for this is the fact that decisions regarding funding are made on the basis of proposals prepared and submitted from the field. No grants program can, in reaching its intent, rise appreciably above the quality and imagination of the proposals submitted. For a Federal agency to work directly with even a limited number of schools or colleges in the preparation of proposals meeting Congressional intent would require staff size that is not feasible. In addition, the propriety of such a course of action is questionable.

We recommend that the Congress authorize Executive agencies to use a small portion of program funds to enter into contracts with state departments of education, universities, or other similar organizations for the purpose of setting up local program information and proposal development centers. This can be undertaken on a limited, experimental basis employing varied formats to test this idea. Such centers would, with the help of the agency staff, work with school systems or institutions to develop the quality of proposals needed. This service would be particularly helpful to small school systems and institutions which are not now able to compete effectively with others for scarce funds.

Special Pilot Centers

To serve children from low-income families constructively, great advances must be made in the caliber and performance of educational personnel. This calls for extraordinary expenditures of talent, imagination and money upon personnel development - and clearly demands heavy investments of Federal government resources to supplement those available from state and local resources.

To make these advances permanent, however, requires an addition to normal funding strategy. It is not enough to distribute sorely needed funds among the hundreds of localities seeking to cope with staffing of schools which must offer new advantages to these youth. There must also be funding to develop much better patterns, procedures, and materials than now exist.

It is inescapable that the Congress and the Executive Branch agencies will come under great pressure to use every penny to combat immediate crises. It is not easy to take a long-term look and steadfastly reserve appreciable funds for problem solution as opposed to remedial improvisations. But if this problem is not to be ours perpetually, it is essential that longer range and more fundamental attacks be funded also.

Tangibly, we suggest that from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and from various other appropriations aimed at improvements in the education of children from low-income families, $10 million to $15 million annually

should be earmarked to support long-range contracts with a very few pilot centers to produce - through action-centered trials in live situations - promising leads to new styles of staff functioning and staff development in poverty-surrounded schools.

Eligibility of Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools

Schools and programs operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs are apparently not now technically eligible for personnel development benefits provided by the Education Professions Development Act or the Vocational Education Act. We recommend that Acts providing education personnel development programs be amended to remedy this oversight.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL EFFORT

Realization of the high aim of education personnel development is dependent on the level of support to this endeavor, the quality of effort displayed by schools and institutions of higher education, and many other factors. The way the Federal government is organized to implement legislation in this area bears very directly on a new level of achievement. Two aspects of this matter invite particular attention.

Diversity and Efficiency

The first of these concerns the question of consolidating education personnel development programs in one Department of the Federal government. Currently such programs are administered by the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, Office of Economic Opportunity, Labor Department, National Institutes of Health, National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, and others.

The fact that diverse agencies are responsible for the

training and development of different categories (and sometimes the same categories) of personnel does present problems. Because of this dispersion, schools and colleges may not be aware of the resources available; it may not be apparent, in the field, how the resources of one agency may reinforce those of another; administrative procedures (deadlines, requirements, etc.) vary considerably from agency to agency.

One response to these problems would be to collect the functions related to education personnel development into one Executive Branch agency. This is advocated by many as an immediate necessity. Cogent arguments support their contentions. If one responds only to the criterion of managerial control, such a course of action would be indicated. But there is another - equally compelling - consideration here: the need to preserve diversity. And this consideration merits sober thought. For the last decade the nation's concern for quality education has been centered on skills and efficiency. This is still true today. But as we achieve these goals, our more important concerns still

lie with the shaping force of education. These concerns are not alone to test various methods and approaches. They must also deal with issues in the realm of ideology, philosophy, value. Therefore this nation should be much concerned to see that power to make crucial decisions about education is not monopolized - in any place for any purpose.

The retention of diversity appears to this Council as an overriding imperative. There are many organizational means available to reduce confusion and to guard against duplications. (One major step in this direction is the burden of our next recommendation.) And we should emphasize, too, that we are not necessarily endorsing the current pattern for the placement of these programs. But at the present time we advise against consolidation of all education personnel development programs into a single, monolithic agency.

A Department of Education

It is our judgment that the Federal government's involvement in education could be made more effective by the estab-

lishment of a Department of Education with Cabinet rank.

While it is important that there not be excessive concentration of power concerning education in any one part of the Federal government, it is also necessary that there be some unit in the Federal structure to which is assigned major responsibility for educational endeavor. The nature of that unit - its status, functions, and capacity - is the second aspect of this Council's concern for the way the Federal effort is organized.

Advances in education personnel development are related to progress in other types of educational activity. Hence, in considering various forms of organization for the Federal effort, we have examined both the needs of education personnel development and the needs of education generally. From this examination has emerged our conviction that a Department is the form best suited to current needs. Several reasons prompted us to make this recommendation.

First, education is rapidly becoming one of the chief concerns of American society. This development should be

reflected in the structure of government at all levels. The chief spokesman for education at the Federal level should have a voice in the Cabinet. He should also have at his command the resources which will enable him to insure the effective execution of existing statutes and the formulation of sound educational policy. A Departmental structure best meets these requirements.

Second, education personnel development programs involve making judgments about the most delicate issues facing a society. That part of the Federal government concerned with these judgments should have the stature, organization, and staff adequate to cope with such an awesome task.

Third, a substantial amount of significant legislation affecting education has been passed in the last few years. The establishment of a Department of Education would permit a fresh approach to organization based on the experience gained in implementing these many statutes.

Finally, the policy of placing educational programs in a variety of Federal agencies - endorsed earlier in this section - will require some means for coordinating these

efforts. A Department of Education can be given statutory authority and responsibility (1) to provide this coordination; (2) to preserve and encourage the unique position and style of each agency in its approach to education personnel development matters; (3) to provide a single source of information about all agencies administering programs in this area; and (4) to serve as a source to which those in the field may refer problems which develop from the fact that a number of agencies are playing a role in this kind of endeavor.

Effecting coordination means, in this instance, maintaining a balance between efficiency and diversity. Dealing with such sensitive matters requires a unit of government capable of insuring that both these important ends are achieved.

Organization Within the Office of Education

The organizational structure used by the Office of Education to discharge its responsibilities for education personnel development is a primary concern of the Commissioner of Education. But the rationale, objectives, and achievements of the structure adopted also concern the President

and the Congress. For this reason, an explanation of a recommendatio addressed in administrative terms to the Commissioner of Educatio·n is incorporated in this section of our Report.

Historically, programs relating to the training and development of educational personnel were not administered by a single unit of the Office of Education; rather, they were to be found in a variety of Bureaus and Divisions, the training or personnel development aspect being a component of the programs administered by those divisions.

With the passage of the Education Professions Development Act, recognition was given to the fact that the nation needed to focus special attention and resources on the development of education personnel. The Bureau of Educational Personnel Development was authorized and created in March of 1968. Some programs, up to that point administered elsewhere within the Office of Education, were now located in the new Bureau. Others were not changed. At least eight divisions within the Office of Education, but outside of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, now have responsibility for some type of education personnel development activity.

It is considered highly desirable that the administration of these programs be located in the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. The Commissioner's arrangements for implementing legislation relating to training and development of vocational education personnel provides a useful guide in effecting this change. In this instance, policies will be developed by a committee consisting of representatives from the Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs, the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, and other related Bureaus. The Bureau of Educational Personnel Development will have primary administrative responsibility for this program.

With appropriate modifications it would appear this organizational arrangement would be applicable to other comparable situations in the Office of Education and we are so recommending to the Commissioner. We believe the President and the Congress will find that decided advantages will result from this administrative action.

IV. EDUCATION PERSONNEL FOR STUDENTS FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The plight of the poor, the black, the Mexican-Americans, and other victims of historic injustices in American society occasions great concern to this Council. Education has an important part to play in a total attack on this problem. The decisiveness of its contribution to meeting this present crisis and to the eventual solution of the problem depends to a large extent on the caliber, characteristics, and quantity of educational personnel available to serve these youth. This Council plans to submit a separate report on this subject in the coming year.

The Highest Priority

At this time, however, we should point out that many promising endeavors are being designed to increase the number and effectiveness of educational personnel now serving, or available to serve in schools having a concentration of students from low-income families. Consequently, this Council has advised the Commissioner of Education that highest

priority should be accorded the funding of these kinds of endeavors.

Approaches to the Problem

The problem facing most young people from low-income families are different in kind, as well as in degree, from those confronting youth from more favored circumstances. It is imperative that all aspects of educational improvement and reform, especially in the realm of education professions development, reflect this basic fact. It follows that our approaches to the education of these young people must also be different in kind, not just in degree; that is, not just more intensive applications of existing practice to make up for lost ground.

At another level there are policies which, while relevant to all settings, require special resources and imagination when applied to the education of those outside the mainstream of American life. We outline some of these below:

1. The development of a sense of community is fundamental in the whole approach to providing educa-

tional opportunities for students from low-income families. That is to say, education should not be treated as an isolated factor in the general strategy of improving the quality of life for this segment of American society. Educational efforts should draw on whatever sense of community exists in a given area; they should, in turn, encourage a situation in which individuals develop a sense of belonging to a group; they should draw on the assets of the community, using not only the schools that exist, but all other forces that will contribute to improvement. However, such efforts should not serve to reinforce an enclave or "ghetto" situation. Tangibly, this means than those from the community involved in educational activities should, when appropriate, seek training outside this setting. Similarly, the community should be hospitable to the use of personnel and training resources which are not located in the community, but which could provide additional support.

2. It is important that those receiving funds from a Federal agency show clearly how the educational per-

sonnel will, as a result of enrollment in a given program, be able to improve the quality of the educational program of the schools or colleges in which they are to serve. Such plans should include achievable goals, the means for achieving these goals and, most important, the specification of ways by which results can be demonstrated.

Evaluation must extend beyond the administration of standardized tests. It must make some assessment of how the program affects the attitudes of the learner and his ways of dealing with educational problems. To provide such information, the full range of evaluative methods must be employed, finely measured or highly impressionistic. The end of this must be some documented answers to the question of what has happened to children as a result of the training program for the professional.

3. For such settings, cadre or group training must figure much larger than it has in the past. The several categories of educational personnel (administrators, teachers, counselors, aides, parents, and others) from a school or other reasonably sized unit of a school

system should receive a significant portion of their training together. One of the chief objectives of this approach is to insure that as each person is advancing in the knowledge and skills related to his particular role, he will benefit from the training of others engaged in a common activity, and will have an increased appreciation of the part others play in the education of a given group of children.

4. The success of many proposals involves the participation of personnel from agencies or institutions other than the one submitting the proposals, and sources of funds other than the Federal grant requested. The solicitation of these additional resources is encouraged. However, the success of an endeavor calling for outside resources can be jeopardized unless definite understandings on these matters are reached in advance. Hence, we urge that those submitting proposals be required to submit clear evidence that such commitments can be fulfilled.

5. Efforts in these areas will be considerably more effective if a framework is established for

encouraging the development of differentiated roles and "career ladders" for personnel in the enterprise. Such arrangements will make it possible for a variety of people, not now involved, to make a contribution. Maturity, variety of experience, and special skills will be important attributes of these new roles. These attributes should be taken into account in making judgments about the competence of people performing these roles, and in developing policies for the licensing or certification of this category of personnel.

6. The effectiveness of the training of educational personnel will be enhanced if programs are related more clearly to actual conditions encountered in the schools and colleges. Programs undertaken as joint efforts of community groups and organizations, school districts and institutions of higher education would make this more possible.

Obviously, not all training should be conducted under such auspices. The setting and arrangements in any given circumstance should be selected on the basis of the needs of the individuals involved.

7. Events of the last several years underscore the importance of utilizing and developing the leadership potential of residents of communities with concentrations of low-income families. This leadership will affect the outcomes of education effort whether the persons are involved directly, or only indirectly, with an educational activity.

8. Ways by which young people might play a part in the initiation, implementation, and evaluation of proposals related to the development of education personnel ought to be explored. Those in the schools and colleges are profoundly affected by the character and quality of the training of educational personnel. The insights of selected numbers of students can make an important contribution by providing a different perspective on professional training.

The last few years have made it painfully evident that, in dealing with the special problems of youth from low-income families, our knowledge is meager. Increasing support is now

being given to projects concerned with these problems. But this effort must be stepped up sharply in the next two years. For it is only from such endeavors that we will gain the knowledge we need.

V. MANPOWER: QUALITY AND QUANTITY

Meeting Quality and Quantity Needs

"The purpose of this title is to improve the quality of teaching and to help meet critical shortages of adequately trained educational personnel. . . ." This is the opening language of the "Statement of Purpose" of the Education Professions Development Act. Other statutes related to education personnel development reflect similar objectives. In developing policies with respect to the funding of proposals, Federal agencies need to take into account both the two-fold intent of legislation in this area (improving quality and meeting critical shortages), and the varying manpower needs that are found in the several fields of employment. This Council's recommendations on this matter deal with three general situations which presently prevail:

Case I. The first is one in which an available supply of legally qualified personnel exceeds the demand. (An example is the teaching of English at the secondary level.)

In such cases, we recommend that only a very few proposals be funded and that those selected be ones which stand out clearly as having the potential for becoming exemplary programs. Ample funds should be provided these programs to insure that they do, in fact, become centers of excellence. By selecting outstanding proposals and by making them highly visible, it will be possible to establish a standard against which others may judge their efforts. By analyzing the factors which contributed to the success of these programs and by disseminating such information, it will be possible to suggest to others the ways by which their programs may be strengthened.

Case II. The second case involves fields where there is an acute quantitative manpower shortage. (Examples of such cases would be women physical education teachers and personnel for school libraries.) Here we recommend that a large number of programs be funded, and that each be allocated a substantial number of fellowships or other aid with a view to producing practitioners in quantity as quickly as possible. Typically, it is in these very fields where one encounters

understaffing and excessive work-loads in the institutions offering training programs. Hence, these programs will need funds, in addition to the normal cost-of-education allowances, to increase their effectiveness and their capacity to produce the numbers needed.

Finally, some funds should be given to a few programs in these fields which could, if adequately financed, develop into models of excellence. This action could provide a new standard of quality for fields which are now largely preoccupied with providing enough personnel, even minimally prepared.

Case III. Here there is a situation in which the general field of employment has an adequate supply of manpower, but sub-categories within it are experiencing acute shortages. For example, there is no shortage of teachers of English in the secondary schools. However, it appears there is a shortage of personnel trained in the linguistic approach to this subject. Similarly, while there is no shortage of history teachers on the secondary level, there is a need for additional personnel prepared in the special field of

Afro-American History. We recommend that such instances be treated as special cases of manpower shortage.

Increasing the Impact of Federal Programs

There are over two million educational personnel in the elementary and secondary schools and over three hundred thousand in higher education. Additional tens of thousands are prepared each year for these positions. It is obvious that Federal programs cannot meet all the training and development needs of this vast number of people. Steps must be taken to insure that proposals which have maximum impact, or maximum multiplier effect, be given special attention in the selection of projects to be funded. In the hearings this Council held last summer, this was singled out as a matter of particular concern by a large number of project directors who presented their view on Federal programs. They suggested three ways by which maximum impact or multiplier effect might be achieved:

1. Focus scarce dollars and training personnel in a few locations -- rather than scattering these resources.

2. Train administrators, teachers, para-professionals, etc., from a given school or other unit of a school system as a group. Under present practices, one or two individuals are selected from a faculty and receive training at a university or other setting. Often, when these persons return to their school the full application of their new knowledge and skills is not realized.

This emphasis on group or cadre training should be applied with discrimination. There are circumstances when the training of individuals is the most desirable and appropriate course of action.

3. Focus on those positions, whose holders which can influence or develop the capacities of a large number of other educational personnel. Examples of such positions would be team leaders in the elementary schools, department heads or principals in high schools, and those in higher education substantially involved in the development of educational personnel. This way to achieve maximum impact is not only consistent with cadre training; it is a necessary condition for the latter to be effective.

Someone in the group must have the special knowledge or skills to insure that development in the group is fruitful.

We recommend that these means be employed to increase the impact of Federal programs.

Need for Manpower Data

Throughout this Report reference is made to "manpower data". Such references have been made in connection with setting priorities, providing for special needs of students of low-income groups, establishing distinctions between quality and quantity problems, insuring that prudent use is made of human talent, and at many other points. Recommendations have been made which assume the availability of manpower data that will bear directly on the decisions called for. The fact is that much - perhaps most - of the data needed for these critical decisions are not available.

One of the principal problems here is that current manpower data are in such gross, aggregate form that they are of little or no use for many of the kinds of decisions that

must be made in the course of formulating policy or implementing legislation. As an example, we have data which indicate that by the mid-seventies, doctoral production will be at a level which will assure a balance between supply and demand in the staffing of higher education. What these data do not reveal, however, is whether the special manpower needs of junior colleges can be met from the total supply. Many other examples of this kind of limitation could be cited.

So important is this matter that this Council will submit a special report on the subject. This report will deal with the kinds of data needed, appropriate data collection systems, special studies needed in the manpower area, and the organization and resources needed to provide this information.

One of the sections of the Education Professions Development Act directs the Commissioner of Education to "from time to time appraise the Nation's existing and future personnel needs in the field of education . . . . " But no funds are authorized to carry out this directive. Nor do other Federal agencies equipped to undertake manpower investigations have staff or funds adequate for this task. We hope the Congress

will provide the funds for this assessment to be carried out.

Proposals to Serve Special Needs

In the Fiscal Year 1970, the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development plans to allocate up to fifty percent of its funds for programs related to the training of personnel who will serve young people from families of low-income. There may be a tendency for schools and colleges to feel that the only acceptable proposals under this priority will be those in which all elements of a training program deal specifically with the problems of this group of students. We recommend that the Bureau encourage a variety of approaches to the training of such personnel, including those which emphasize broad training with specialization which builds on fundamental understandings.

Disparities Between Proposals Submitted and Needs in Certain Fields

Most Federal government agencies which administer personnel development programs follow the practice of making a general

announcement regarding their programs, and inviting agencies or institutions to submit proposals. By one means or another, the agency selects for funding the best of the proposals submitted. In some instances, such a practice does not always yield the number or the quality of proposals needed for a particular category of educational personnel. Paradoxically, this happens more frequently in fields, or problem areas, which are suffering from acute shortages of qualified personnel, or in situations where a distinct need for improvement of quality is indicated.

We recommend that, where a need for numbers or quality of personnel in a given category is clearly established, and where experience shows a deficiency in the number or quality of proposals submitted, the agencies actively solicit proposals to remedy this lack. In some instances an agency's efforts at solicitation may have to extend to the point of assisting in the development of plans which will result in a high quality proposal. Both active solicitation, and the rendering of assistance to those preparing proposals will, of course, mean that the agency have the requisite staff, in terms of numbers

and special competence, to carry out these important tasks.

VI. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

We see the need for four kinds of effort under the heading of research and evaluation related to education personnel development.

1. Basic research on learning must be supported. Investigators must be assured of this support particularly for inquiries which will last over a considerable period of time; they should not be pressed to seek applications of their knowledge; they should not be confined to one type of inquiry. We do not know at this point whether the most useful answers will come from the behavioral sciences, from neurological or biochemical investigations or from other fields of inquiry. What we do know is that more knowledge about the nature of learning will be needed in bringing about fundamental improvements in the training and development of educational personnel.

2. A second form of activity might be called "research in the middle range." Here we draw on the

little fundamental knowledge available to deal with important questions more directly related to the development of educational personnel. Specifically, we have in mind attempts to establish whatever relationships we can between the "human input" (e.g. qualities possessed by teachers, counselors, etc.) and student achievement. We should emphasize that we would define "achievement" here to include not only whether a child can read, but also whether he becomes a more humane person as a result of the special influence of the people in education who touch his life.

This kind of endeavor may, because of the limits of basic knowledge, yield few immediate and demonstrable outcomes. But the prospects that there will be some results which will better inform us in the development of policies make it imperative that this kind of research be supported.

3. Evaluations of education personnel development activities must be undertaken. Judgments must be made about the effectiveness of overall programs administered

by the agencies and about individual projects funded by an agency.

Several cautions should be expressed. A requirement that every funded project be responsible for arranging some sort of formal evaluation is not realistic. Some are so small that to devote scarce dollars to evaluation is sheer waste. It is likewise wasteful to insist on types of evaluation beyond the capacity of those asked to carry them out. In such instances granting agencies can be staffed to provide direct assistance in conducting evaluation.

A variety of modes of evaluation should be employed. A thoughtful paper prepared by a project director setting forth his observations about what is being accomplished may be more revealing than data coming from a sophisticated research design.

Finally, we suggest it may be useful practice to evaluate the merits of an agency's program by concentrating on those several projects which are considered to be the "best" of the group funded. Such a strategy

would conserve limited funds available for evaluation. More important, if there is any prospect of significant results from a Federal program, such evidence is most likely to be found in those projects which, on gross judgment, are thought to be the most effective. If intensive investigation does reveal unusual success, then the inquiry could be pursued further to see what factors contributed to this outcome. Such information could be used effectively in other funded projects in the program.

4. <u>There is a desperate need for simple data about educational personnel with respect to recruitment, retention, aspirations, rewards, characteristics, and quality of training.</u> Information on these topics is vitally needed for decisions involving substantial amounts of money and important policy questions. Yet such information is either inadequate, inaccurate or lacking.

In the pursuit of the several forms of inquiry outlined above, we urge

1. acceptance of the idea that there are many types of research and many modes of evaluation. These run from highly subjective hunch-finding to the most disciplined empirical research. One type may be more appropriate for certain classes of problem than another. But all are legitimate. It would be unwise to employ only one type of research or evaluation in investigations relating to educational personnel.

2. that, in instances where richer, more varied, more sensitive assessment practices are employed, a wide variety of people be called upon to participate - not only technical research personnel, but scholars of various disciplines, teachers, laymen, and in some instances, students.

3. that a significant portion of research monies be earmarked for "high risk-potentially high gain" kinds of endeavors. This will take courage because typically the researcher can offer nothing but an

intriguing hunch to support his claim to funds.

Review and Selection of Proposals

There is probably no more important function performed by Federal agencies involved in education personnel development than the selection of proposals for funding. This process involves millions of dollars; the outcome affects hundreds of school systems and institutions of higher education; the pattern of decisions as to which proposals get funded and which do not becomes, in effect, a policy of the government.

In making decisions about funding, Federal agencies must, of course, take into account how a given set of proposals will improve the qualifications of a particular category of educational personnel. However, they should also consider how such proposals will contribute to the improvement of the total educational program in schools and colleges. To insure that both objectives receive attention, we recommend that agencies seek counsel from two types of advisory groups.

The first would be concerned solely with the formulation of broad educational goals that might be achieved by the program. For this reason, such a body should include laymen,

administrators, board members, and students, in addition to teachers and scholars from a given field and related fields.

The second group would be responsible for reviewing and making recommendations regarding proposals submitted. It would use as criteria not only the standards and requirements of a particular field of employment, but also the statement of broad educational goals provided by the first group. Consultants chosen for this task would be those whose competence is related specifically to the nature of the proposals under consideration.

VII. THE FUTURE

In the recommendations which have been made in the preceding sections (and those addressed to the Commissioner which follow) we have emphasized the critical importance of making our present programs work effectively.

It would be unfortunate if this position were construed to mean that the nation has done all that is needed in the way of providing the personnel for the quality of education fitting for this country; or if this position were construed to mean that all we need now is a tightening up in organization, more careful attention to implementation, more efficiency.

This Council feels compelled to say that, for all the advances we have made in the past few years, it is but a beginning. More than this, we feel a sense of urgency about what must be done.

To conclude that education is in anything but a state of crisis would be to seriously misinterpret the events of the past few years. People have been assaulted in the

schools and colleges, universities have become armed camps, education in the cities has been brought to a halt for weeks while power struggles play themselves out.

While these are dramatic examples of this crisis, there are other, less visible, signs that the social institution we call education is experiencing grave difficulties: a higher education system whose survival requires financial support in the billions; school systems not sure whether their budgets will carry them through the year; teachers in the schools and colleges whose lack of interest or competence makes them unsuitable to deal adequately with the needs of their students; curricula which are designed for another age. Such is the turmoil of the present.

And as we contemplate the problems of the now, we are reminded that the future will require even more in the way of an educated citizenry. Complexity and change will characterize this future. It is a complexity which baffles the wisest and most expert. Increasingly, it seems, social policies designed to correct one problem, beget two. It is a kind of change so swift and so profound that we find our

way of life changing not in a generation, but in a half-generation.

"Thinking about the unthinkable" has meaning far beyond the threat of nuclear extinction. If the developments in science offer new boons to the quality of life in the future, they also pose some frightening dilemmas in a variety of social, political and ethical questions. The gap between these seemingly unanswerable dilemmas and our capacity to respond to them is already having its effect. Irving Kristol has noted "the slow draining away of legitimacy from existing institutions and prevailing traditions. . . . What exists is vulnerable for no other reason than that it exists - and because the citizenry no longer feels any particular responsibility for its existence, any instinctive obligation to sustain or even reform it. The effect is of disengagement and a sense of powerlessness on the part of the majority, of alienation and irresponsible power on the part of every organized minority, and of purposelessness on the part of both."(1)

---

(1) Fortune, July 1968, p. 41.

It is undoubtedly these thoughts which moved President Nixon, in his Inaugural Address, to characterize our time as experiencing a "crisis of the spirit".

It is obvious that an education that finds itself struggling to provide even minimal literacy is going to have to be re-cast if it is to cope with these kinds of problems. And it is obvious also that our best efforts at preparing those who influence the young, and at providing them with the proper conditions for educating, are not good enough.

Measured against current needs or the demands of the future, our present efforts must be seen as only a start down a very long road. In special reports during the year we shall deal with areas in which new efforts are needed. Illustrative of the kinds of problems which require urgent action are the following:

> Much of what needs to be accomplished in education personnel development depends on the quality of our system of higher education. Post-secondary education has entered a period of great change. Enrollment has risen sharply, and the rate of increase will accelerate in the next several years. New forms of educational programs must be introduced to provide for the changing nature of the student population. Higher education needs financial support on a greatly increased level to enable it to maintain present quality and cope with these new problems.

It is clear that communities must and will be involved with the programs of the schools. It is important that those who send their children to schools have a stake in them and that many of the parents and neighbors of children attending schools help those schools by direct service within them. Programs of recruitment and training are needed, on a scale not heretofore considered, to insure that people from the community can offer constructive service.

There is general agreement that extending educational advantages to the very young child is crucial to the development of his full potential. Despite this knowledge, we have made no significant investment here. Providing these educational opportunities will require that, among other steps, we develop the capacity to recruit and train thousands of additional personnel.

Increasing attention has been given to the important role of vocational education in the United States. However, fresh approaches to the development of educational personnel and very substantial funds for this activity will be needed if the young are to be provided meaningful preparation for the world of work.

The progress of developing nations depends, to a very important degree, on their ability to establish workable educational systems. The problems they confront are staggering. Just in terms of the relationship between the stability of these nations and the preservation of world peace, this country's priority for assistance in international education must be very high indeed.

Problems of this sort are complex. Devising ways to deal with them will require imagination and careful planning. Time will be required to work out effective strategies. As we have pointed out, one of the most highly profitable strategies available is that of education personnel development. We think this is an area in which massive, immediate investment can be made by the Federal government with assurance and confidence. We recommend to the President and the Congress that intensive planning start immediately to have new and major programs readied for implementation in Fiscal Year 1971 at the latest.

Recommendations Addressed

to the Commissioner of Education

The Annual Report of this Council is addressed to the President and the Congress. However, the Commissioner of Education has repeatedly requested the Council's advice on policies of direct concern to the Office of Education. Therefore it seemed useful to include in this Report certain observations and recommendations concerning matters under his cognizance.

* * * *

This Council is most favorably impressed with the interest in education personnel development evident in every sector of the Office of Education. The Commissioner and his top staff have accorded a degree of support and encouragement to the Council itself decidedly beyond the normal call of duty. In our contacts with division personnel we have discovered genuine expectation that education personnel development may become the key engagement of the Office of Education in the future. The new Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, established less than a year ago, seems to be increasingly accepted by all units of the Office as a focal point for the coordination of diverse personnel development

efforts. This we applaud heartily. It is only a beginning for what should be a continuing and constructive re-casting of the organization of education personnel development functions in the Office.

A Creative Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

It is imperative that the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development be administered creatively. This Bureau must recognize the high quality of much of the present practice in the development of education personnel at all levels, but it must also consistently try to improve that practice. In some cases tradition has glorified practices that are no longer fully useful. In other cases, legislation inhibits new forms of teacher training and employment. Within the educational system, specialists and professions may have divergent goals which, while protecting self-interest, hinder progress. The structure of education is rapidly changing and the new demands for personnel that are being created must be met by fresh approaches as well as by tried and true practice.

This means that the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, in discharging its responsibility for administering Federal government programs, should not only seek to strengthen good practice within our existing systems of professional development, but also creatively and aggressively encourage even better practices. The Bureau should encourage and where necessary stimulate innovative proposals in the areas of teacher training, certification, tenure at both pre-college and college level, promotion, retirement, and mobility within the system. It is vital that the Bureau be a creative force for improved quality and practice in all these areas.

An important way in which the Bureau can give expression to this creative approach entails working more closely with partners outside the Bureau - with other bureaus in the Office of Education; with agencies of the Federal government involved in education professions development matters; with institutions of higher education throughout the country; with state departments of education and other state agencies; and with local school systems. This will have to be done on

a more substantial scale than heretofore. In some instances this will involve cooperation; in other cases, coordination; probably most often, active solicitation. And the initiative in seeking all three should come from the Bureau.

We suggest that these initiatives take the following form:

1. Many gains could result from working more closely with other agencies of the Federal government engaged in education personnel development. More than willingness to cooperate will be involved. Active seeking after common cause, by persuasion and cultivation, is indicated. It is felt that something better than the present degree of coordination will result. This is not likely to come about from intricate machinery or token conferences; it is more likely to occur through informal, but genuine, efforts to get the job done.

2. Similar efforts will have to be undertaken with other bureaus within the Office of Education whose functions involve centrally or indirectly matters of

education personnel development. The organizational arrangements set up by the Commissioner with reference to the administration of Part F of the Education Professions Development Act (related to vocational education) provide a formal means by which coordination of effort may proceed. In other instances, and in the absence of such formal arrangements, informal coordination and cooperation will have to take place. Again, we urge that the initiative be taken by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

3. It is obvious that the Bureau of Research and the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development share a common concern when the development of educational personnel is involved. Some special and concerted joint planning is, therefore, indicated. The lines between "research" and "development" are not clearly drawn. Therefore these two bureaus must maintain a constant exchange of information to the end that each will be reinforcing the other's endeavors.

4. It is important that every feasible interchange between the Bureau and state educational personnel responsible for Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, officials of Head Start and other comparable endeavors, be undertaken to secure additional impact from the personnel development possibilities in these programs. Such interchange might well proceed into the several "state" plans which are emerging in connection with development of educational personnel. (It should be noted that this Council is not advocating any regulatory or guideline approach here; rather, it is urging a developmental, open cooperation between the two parties.)

5. Another avenue of cooperation is to be found in the cultivation of additional liaison with state-centered planning efforts - governmental, non-governmental and cooperative. We recognize that state level planning is for the most part only in its beginning stages with reference to the development of personnel; further, for many reasons the efforts of institutions

and agencies cannot be restricted within state boundaries. However, state plans and policies do have widespread effects on educational personnel; the state government and state organizations are in a position of strategic power; and, it apprears that planning of the sort indicated is taking on new life in some states. For these reasons, it is important that the Bureau become actively involved in these emerging plans.

6. The previous two recommendations involve relationships with the state departments of education and other state agencies. For such efforts to be effective these agencies need to be staffed by highly trained personnel. The Bureau should explore ways by which it might aid in the training and improvement of personnel in state departments of education. This might be done either through the Education Professions Development Act or under a cooperative effort with the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education which administers Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. If additional authorizations are needed, they should be sought from Congress.

It is recognized that the Bureau will not be able to carry out these creative approaches to management unless it has the requisite staff and advisers. A small task force should be created to examine this problem so that appropriate recommendations may be made to the Commissioner. These recommendations should cover the functions to be served, the structure to be set up, the staffing and funds needed.

Use of the Priorities Approach

The Council is in strong accord with the position taken by the Office of Education in the matter of designating certain categories for priority consideration in the administration of Federal programs. It has so informed the Congress and the President in the knowledge that some members of the 90th Congress displayed a different stance toward this practice. Within the broad priority concerns established by the Congress there are subpriority concerns which the Executive Branch can use to best realize the intent of legislation.

Despite this endorsement, we must express some misgivings about the way in which this priorities approach is

developed and applied in connection with education personnel development. What are called priorities are too often merely areas of concern, not identified objectives to be achieved. Second, designating a multitude of categories as priorities (as, for example, in the plans being considered by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development) seems to overextend the very idea of priority. Third, it is difficult to discover enough concentration of support being available for any so-called priority to produce significant results.

Finally, it is extremely important that the rationale justifying the establishment of any given priority should be fully developed, bringing to bear all available evidence. Confidence in the selection of a particular category for priority treatment - and the idea of priority-setting itself - rests on the fact that a sound case can be made for devoting special resources to one objective as opposed to another.

We recommend that the Office of Education continue to apply the priority approach where permitted by law, and at the same time to employ increased sophistication in determining priorities.

New Directions in Policy and Procedure

One of the revealing - and perplexing - discoveries by Council is the frenetic pace at which the Office of Education must move. The fact that policies, regulations and guidelines are produced at all is praiseworthy; that they are so generally satisfactory is remarkable. The dispatch with which the intricate processing of applications is handled merits compliments under the circumstances. (In the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development alone thirty-five hundred proposals were received last year.) But the problems experienced by those in the field clearly indicate that substantial improvements and reform should be sought in these matters.

Chronic understaffing and overloading of the Office of Education, and the extreme complexity of the tasks themselves, combine to make effective administration of these programs extremely difficult. However, even at best these factors will remain endemic. Facing this is a fact of life and hence a condition to be overcome by imaginative approaches to the problem.

We recommend that a small intra-Office task force be set up to deal with administrative policies and procedures related to education professions development programs, and to produce within three months a plan for drastic reform - workable under existing circumstances - in these areas.

This task force should be directed to look at these policies and procedures from the point of view of the schools and colleges. The primary attention of this group would be focussed on regulations and guidelines; the scheduling of dates for submitting proposals and for announcing grants; the documentation required in proposals and applications; and procedures for reviewing and screening proposals. Examination of these procedures would be undertaken with the object of (a) simplifying them and (b) removing all evidence of excessive regulation and prescription. We feel confident that such a task force could produce some pilot reforms for immediate testing.

While we have suggested a particular approach to dealing with this problem, we should stress that it is the intent and not the form which we urge upon the Commissioner of Education.

The Use of Local Contexts

Personnel development in education can take a variety of forms. Some are more effective than others.

Within the creatively interpreted limits of current legislation, the Office of Education should seek to place Federal support primarily in projects which place education personnel development in local contexts where there is a comprehensive, cooperative attack on system problems.

(a) We suggest this as across-the-board policy for all education personnel development programs administered by the Office of Education - institutes, fellowships other than NDEA Title IV, institutional training programs, in-service projects, etc.

(b) "System problems" include curriculum change, methodological change, organizational and structural change, change in objectives, new approaches to the needs of student groups, etc.

(c) "Local contexts" is intended to mean actual endeavors, organized by plan, to accomplish, or test, or explore a program change. This may well be a state

plan to provide more adequate educative opportunities for four-year-olds, for example. Or it may be an endeavor in education within a given ghetto. The key ingredient is all-out, multi-faceted attack where doing - instead of passive studying about - is prominent.

(d) Perhaps the most important desideratum is that students, parents, and community groups as well as the various institutionalized agencies be involved in these endeavors as bona fide partners. The objective in having these people work together is to conduct education personnel development as an integral part of system reform and improvement.

Additional Actions

Finally, we set forth, for the consideration of the Commissioner and his staff, several additional recommendations which do not fall appropriately under any of the preceding sections.

1. Education personnel development activities are located in a variety of units of the Office of Education. Some are carried out as programs which are easily identified (e.g., fellowship programs). In other cases, personnel development is a component of an "action" program, as with Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some are administered directly by the Office; others through the states. Because these activities within the Office are so dispersed, it is important to have a system for securing, and quickly collating information on the total range of these activities. To cite an example, information on the overall pattern of funding in various categories (e.g., the several subject matters, levels, student populations affected, etc.) will increasingly prove to be necessary in formulating Office-wide strategy in this kind of endeavor.

2. It is already evident that provisions for the trainers of teachers for post-secondary instruction will be crucial to improvements of rapidly expanding

institutions like junior colleges and technical institutes. We suggest that the Bureau of Higher Education and the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development agree that the latter take leadership in using both Part D and E funding for significant attacks on this problem.

3. On January 17, 1969, awards for the first grants under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act were announced. We applaud two policies apparently underlying these awards. First, institutions received enough fellowships to justify a cohesive program for the recipients and to provide institutional support sufficient to underwrite genuine program development. The prevailing pattern of eight to twelve fellowships per institution is much superior to a pattern of only two or four fellowships to each awardee. Second, several institutions not members of the "old establishment" in college teacher preparation received awards. We hope the proportion of such institutions can be increased in subsequent awards. The fresh

approach that such institutions can bring to the preparation of teachers and administrators for higher education will bring added strength to this endeavor.

4. In our recommendations to the President and Congress we are urging realistic appropriations for staffing the Office of Education and for costs involved in proposal review and program evaluation. We hope the Commissioner will battle hard for Executive Branch appropriation requests sufficient to enable the Office to administer programs of our concern with vigor and imagination.

Concluding Statement

Any report such as this concentrates upon changes. But by omission of mention, this Report has really emphasized our conviction the Office of Education is on the right track, making commendable headway far more often and more significantly than it is in doubtful territory. Faced with tasks of tremendous complexity, and with conditions of baffling intensity, the Commissioner of Education and his staff have

turned in a highly commendable performance with relation to the field of this Council's concern.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Sister Mary Corita, IHM[1]
Professor of Art
Immaculate Heart College
Los Angeles, California

Don Davies[2]
Executive Secretary
National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards
National Education Association
Washington, D. C.

Adron Doran
President
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky

Annette Engel
Coordinator, Counseling Services
Roosevelt School District
Phoenix, Arizona

Rupert Evans[3]
Dean
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Susan W. Gray
Director, Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee

Laurence D. Haskew (Chairman)
Professor of Educational Administration
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

E. Leonard Jossem
Chairman
Department of Physics
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Marjorie S. Lerner
Principal
George T. Donoghue Elementary School
Chicago, Illinois

Kathryn W. Lumley
Director
Reading Clinic
Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

Carl L. Marburger
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Trenton, New Jersey

Edward V. Moreno
Supervisor
Bilingual Education
Los Angeles City School Districts
Los Angeles, California

Lloyd N. Morrisett
Vice President
The Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching
New York, New York

Mary Rieke
Chairman
Board of Education
Portland, Oregon

Theodore R. Sizer
Dean
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Bernard C. Watson (Vice-Chairman)
Deputy Superintendent for Planning
Philadelphia School System
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

* * * * *

Joseph Young
Executive Director

---

(1) Resigned July, 1968.
(2) Resigned March, 1968.
(3) Appointed May, 1968.